P.F. 42894

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1888-89

192 .

(L.R.)

File No. 53 of 8

Serial Nos. 1—10

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—10

Major ~~Part~~ B for October 1894

SUBJECT.

Dispute regarding the boundary of Jodi Villapalli Village, Kolar Taluk.

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

boundary
P.R.
Noted

(General Serial No. 30)

188 . (4)

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.

No.

Subject of the draft
Notification, I would
ask the Dy Comr of
Kolar to forward the
Record of enquiry & decision
if any in regard to settlement
of the boundary dispute of
the Devam Village in question.
There is nothing to show that
there was no enquiry.

Otherwise
With reference to the copy
herein received from the Dept
of Revenue Survey, the Dy
Comr of Kolar is requested
to ~~report~~ forward as soon as possible any
record of enquiry held
& decision passed by the
Dy Comr in the matter
of the boundary dispute of
Lodr village of Vittapalli
in the Kolar Talug

Notification of the boundary dispute by the Dy Commr was evidently based on personal enquiry on the spot. It is however defective as there is no record of this settlement and one of the parties is not satisfied with it.

It is therefore necessary to go over the ground again and the Devam requests that an officer of the Survey dept may be deputed for the purpose.

R.G.

26/12

1817190

1817

3

Petition No. 1255 dated 24 August 1888 from Jadidar Shamanah and Karanapah of Vittapalli, Kolar Taluk, Kolar District

Docket No. 696 dated 12 Decr/88 from the Superintendent Rev: Survey.

Docket No. 1635/378 of 1st Septr/90 from the Dy: Commr. Kolar District submitting the file of the papers in the matter of the boundary dispute of Jari Vittapalli

Venkobachary,
Jadidar

Podiar of Gunger
Sanahulli and
others complained
to the Dy: Comnr.
that a portion of
their land belonging
to their Jodi mea-
suring about 30
Kandis had been
included by the Survey
Assistt. Mr Capulow
in defining the
boundary of the land
intended to be made
over to one Mr Lowell

16 February 186-

for

for Gold mining.
The inhabitants of Kolar
24 February 1886 was directed by the
Dy: Commr to make
a personal enquiry
on the spot with
regard to the boundary
dispute complained of
by the Jodidars and
submit a report.
The Amildar submitted
a report regarding
the boundary dispute
of the villages shown

in

in the margin with a plan of the land under dispute. The Sheristadar of Kolar Taluk in his memo: submitted to the Collector states that a portion of Inam land of Gungersamahalli might have been included in Block No. 3 Govt Land. The Sheristadar was directed to submit

Block No. I.

Manighatta, Thondala } Govt. land

Vittapalli, Gungersamahalli, Kistnarayapura } Inam villages

Block No. II.

Naikenahalli, Benagara, Kadabaholuru } Govt. land

Block No. III.

Pommanahalli, Rampurapolem, Nagarathnahalli } Govt. land.

16 March 1886.

the

7

the exact measurement
of the lands in Mani
-ghutta and Thondalu
villages with the
aid of a Measurer
from the Survey Depart
-ment. A plan with
measurement was
accordingly submitted
to the Dy: Comnr.
The whole record
was sent to the Inam
Supt. with a request
to forward to him the
Inam Registers of the
lands

27 Feby/86
9 March/86

lands in dispute as
per chief Secretary's
letter No $\frac{6634}{66}$ of 21st
February 1886. The Inam
Register was received.
The Dy. Commr. held
an enquiry and
after taking depo- 12 March 1886
sitions of Joodar
Venkobachurri Ra-
yapah and Venka-
tagonda a Certificate
of 15 March 1886
signed by Potaiah
Shanbogue, Joodars
and

9

Rpts of

and Gungersamahulli

was drawn up counter-

-signed by the Deputy

Comm^r defining the

boundary of the above

villages and accord-

-ing to the above deci-

-sion boundary stones

were planted. The

27 March 86. Petitioners complained

to the Survey Cert^e

Sup^te that the Dy.

Comm^r had planted

boundary stones with

out

without fully enquir-
-ing into their case
and solicited his
personal inspection
of the spot. He
replied to the Petrs
that he could not
interfere with the
order passed by
the Dy: Commr.
against the
whole order the
Petitioners appealed
to this Office regarding
the

the boundary dispute - The
Petition was sent to
the Supt. Rev: Survey
to report what steps
were taken for the
settlement of the
boundary of the Vittal
pulli village. In
reply he has for-
warded copies of report
from the Asst. Supt.
Rev: Survey and states th
the dispute in question w
already settled by the Dy
Commr. Kolar Dt. -

Docket 2: 29/9/12 Dur/88
This Docket is not in
the file -

2: 696 7/12 Dur/88

A K O Mursing Asst. 24/11/90

N. D. Vitapalli

13

Precis

Petitioners: Narnappa & another Jodidars of Vitapalli in Kolar Taluk.

The petitioners complain that Mr Subbaiah the late Dy Commr of the Kolar District whilst fixing the boundaries of the Manigutta Gold mining Block fixed also the boundaries of Jodi Vitapalli the result of which was that a considerable portion of the said village was included in the adjoining village.

On the 24th August 1888 they presented a petition to Govt to the above effect. Thereupon the Supt of Ren. Survey was requested to

In January 1892 a petn was addressed to this office by Shanbhoganhalli ryots stating that about 10-12 Khandees of dry land of their village have been unjustly included in Vitapalli by the Jodidars.

In Dec 92 Muniyappa & others of Shanbhoganhalli complained to Govt that some portion of their land was unjustly included in Vitapanhalli and stated that Survey Supt had given them an endorst to the effect that Govt orders were awaited on the subject

as to what steps had been taken in his department for the settlement of the boundary dispute in question. No. 2910 of 24.8.88

The Supt. of survey reported that the dispute in question had already been settled by the Deputy Commr. Kolar District. No. 696 of 12.12.

The Deputy Commr. was then requested to forward any record of enquiry held and decision passed by him in the matter of the boundary dispute of Jodi Vitapalli. O.M. No. 4229/196 of 26.7.90.

On receipt of the records from the Deputy Commr., Govt. directed the Supt. of Rev. Survey to cause a fresh enquiry to be made in regard to the boundary dispute of Jodi Vitapalli & decide the matter on its merits, inasmuch as

the settlement made by the Deputy Commr in 1886 did not appear to have been agreed to by the zodidars & the decision of the Deputy Commr did not contain sufficient particulars to shew whether the dispute had been properly settled or not.

1022/16 of 24-4-91

The petitioners also were referred to the Supt of Ker Survey accordingly.

The Survey Supt has forwarded to this office the proceedings shewing the fresh enquiry and settlement of the boundary dispute between Vitapalli and adjoining villages in the Kolar Taluk, by Mr K. Ramaswami Iyengar Asst Supt of Survey. The Supt has further solicited instructions as to whether

No 6489 9-11-92

Mr Ramaswami Iyengar's settlement should be accepted as final.

With regard to the boundary dispute between Jodi Vitapalli and Govt village Maniguttha and Jodi Gangarasankalli of the Kolar Taluk, —

Memo no. I

Mr K. Ramaswami Iyengar Asst Supt of Survey states that the whole of the area in dispute measuring 179 acres 12 guntas was given to the Govt village (Maniguttha) by the Dy Commr after holding an Enquiry, although there is no written order on the subject, that when a measurer was sent to prepare a Takrar naksha a Razeenama was executed by the Shanbhog & some ryots of Maniguttha giving the area to the south of the points 2, 5. 6 on the Takrar naksha to Vitapalli, that Kondareddi patel.

vide "Takrar naksh (plan) attached to the memorandum no. I (the claim of Vitapal is marked by a light blu line, that of the Govt village by a violet line & that of Gangarasankal by a yellow line)

of maniguttu subsequen
complained that the
above Rajeenama
was executed in his
absence and his signat
was forged by interest
parties, that during
the enquiry the Shanbh
adhered to the Rajeenam
and supported the claim
of the zodidars and tha
it is very probable tha
the Shanbhog is in
collusion with the zodi

The Asst. Supt.
of Survey further stat
that the zodidar bas
his claim for the disput
area on (1) a list of
boundary stones drawn
up by two Shekoars in
1843 (2) a Talukcro
in which the bounda
stones mentioned in (1)
are reiterated (3) a list
of boundary stones dra
up by Shanbhog Venkata
in Rudhirodgari an
(4) Pairaish account
of the year Krodhan

(2 & 3 not found)

that the above named document (1) cannot by itself confer any right on the poroiar inasmuch as it was drawn up by such low paid officials as Shekoars in 1843 apparently in the absence of disputing parties, that document (2) cannot be taken as final since there was no reference in it to Ganganarasi which had also then a dispute with Vitapalli, that (3) cannot be believed inasmuch as it purports to be a list of boundary stones drawn up by a Shanbhog without stating under whose orders & why it was drawn up, that (4) also cannot be relied on since it does not bear the signature of any responsible official and that by a reference to the Inam Register of the village it will be seen that no old measurements were available

at the Inam settle-ment and the jodidar's measurements were not then accepted.

The asst. supt. also states that at point 5 on the Jakras nuksha there is a mound which the jodidar identified with the ruins of an old temple referred to in docts. nos. 1 & 2 resply relied on by the jodidar but on examination no foundations of walls were found, that at point 2 there is a boundary stone lying to which no significance can be attached since it is easy to place such stones in favourable situations and that under all the above circumstances he is of opinion that the exclusion of the disputed area from the jodi village by the Dy Commr. is proper.

With regard to the

~~and~~ claims of Gangarasa halli the Asst Supt states that the disputed area was adjudicated to it by Mr Nasirudeen As Inam Asst Commr, that this settlement was not confirmed by the Inam Commr and the dispute was referred to the Survey Deptt, that the jodidars of Gangarasa halli have failed to adduce any documentary evidence in support of their claim and that he would therefore adhere to the decision of the Deputy Commr.

With regard to the boundary dispute between the govt village Shan-bhoganhalli and jodi Vitapalli the Asst Supt of Survey states that the area in dispute is 63 acres 21 gs, that when the govt village was measured in 1886 the whole of the area in dispute was included in it according to the

memo no. II

Takrar naksha accompanying the memo (The claim of the Govt village is shewn by a yellow line & that of the jodi village by a light blue line)

decision of the Dy Commr
that when a measurer
was sent to make a
Takrar naksha the
Shanbhog and the Patel
of the Govt village
executed a Rajeenama
giving the whole of this
land in dispute to the
Jodi village, that the
ryots thereupon complain
-ed that the village
servants were in collusion
with the Jodidars, that
the conduct of the village
servants is highly suspicious
that the Jodidar bases
his claims on the four
documents above refer
to and on the akshia
and the Rudirogari
Paimaishi accounts
of the Govt village, that
in these accounts the
boundary between this
village & Vitapalli
is stated to extend
from a point on the
banks of the "halla"
shewn on the Takrar
naksha to a boundary
stone with letters cut

and thence to Karikal 22
Hutta bande', that the
Jodidar alleges that
point a is the one
referred to in the Paimaish
accounts although there
is no boundary stone
at this point, that
at point c there is how
ever a "bande" which
the Jodidar identifies
with Hutta bande of
the Paimaish accounts
& that the "bande" at
c is one that was likely
to have attracted notice
at the Paimaish.

The Asst Supt. further
states as follows:-
"Relying on the Paimaish
accounts of the Govt. village,
believing the natural
bande" at c as the
natural boundary
referred to in the accounts
and taking into consi
deration the absence
of a "bande" at d along
cd fixed by the Dy Commr.

I beg to recommend that the boundary of the Jodi village be fixed in the disputed area along CE shewn by a red line by which the Jodi village will get 6 yaares & the rest will go to the Goot village.

In the absence of any written reasons for the Dy Comm's decision I have proposed a modification of it.

Memo III
& Jakrar naksha accompanying it.
31. 10. 92

With regard to the boundary dispute between Krishnarajpur a Kayempatta village and Jodi Vitpalli the Asst Supt states that the Kayempattadar has executed a Rajeenama giving up the whole of the area in dispute (13 acres) to Vitapalli that the Dy Comm. had included this portion in Krishna

rajapurii and that
the above Razeenama
may be accepted.

HCh

24/8/88

No 1255

26 (1)

L.R. 53-88

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

29

No 291

1 R.53 88-2

Official Memorandum.

The accompanying petition No 1255 dated 24th August 1888 received at the Dewan's office from Shamanna & Nanappa Jodidars of Villapalli village, Kolar Taluk, is forwarded together with its (fourteen) enclosures, to the Superintendent Reve Survey for report, as to whether the Petrs' complaint is that in March 1866, the boundary of this Inam village was fixed by the Dy Comr in a way which excluded a portion of their land. They allege that no written orders were ever passed by the Dy Comr. The Supdt Reve Survey will be requested to report what steps have been taken in his Deptt for the settlement of the boundary dispute in question & whether such settlement was declined by his Deptt and under what circumstances.

Bangalore 24th August 1888

Sd/ K. S.
Dewan of Mysore

"Copy"

No. 47.

30 1888. 6788

251

From Supt

The Revenue Survey and Assessment, Mysore.

(3)

To The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

Dated
Despatched } 12th December 88
Received

Enclosures No. 2 files.

No. 696 of 1888.

His Docket No. 291 dated 20th August 88 forwarding Petition from the Godidars of Vittapalli in the Kolar Taluk for report as to what steps were taken for the settlement of the boundary of the said village.

L.R. 53-88-2

With reference to the above has the ha

honor to forward the accompanying copies

31

of Reports received from Mr K. Ramswamiengar, Assistant Superintendent, Mysore Revenue Survey from which it will be perceived that the dispute in question had already been settled by the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District.

2. Enclosures to the Docket under reply are herewith returned.

Superintendent
Mysore Rev. Survey

Begs to report as follows.

1 In connection with the Measurement and demarcation of the Manigatta Gold Mining Block, the Deputy Commr. of the Kolar District, under orders from the Dewan, undertook to fix the boundaries between the Manigatta Block and the Jodi villages of Vittahalli, Gangarasanahalli and Krishnarajpur, and personally settled them.

2 The Deputy Commissioner's decision was adhered to in measuring the boundary of the Petitioner's Jodi village Vittahally

partly, adjoining the Manigatta Block. By this, the petitioners complain that a portion of their land has been excluded from their village and included partly in the gold mining block and partly in Shanboganhalli.

'Signed' K. Ramswamiengar
Asst Supt. Mysore
Rev. Survey

Bangalore
8th October/88

No 83

Begs to submit a further report as follows:—

The Vernacular report of Narsimha Linga who measured the line of boundary stating

that

that the Jodidar raised objections
to the decision of the Deputy
Commissioner both at the time
of measurement and inspection
of Boundary Marks is herewith
forwarded.

2 The Jodidar, about 12
days after the dispute was
settled by the Deputy Commr.,
presented a petition complaining
to Mr. D. Appu Rao Asst. Commr.
then in charge of A Establish-
ment who gave an endorsement
declining to interfere with the
Deputy Commissioner's decision.

Signed/ K. Ramswamiengar
Asst Supdt.

Bangalore
14th November/88

No 89

Begs to report as follows:—
The

The Vernacular report of Narsimha Linga stating that the Deputy Commissioner when settling the dispute on the spot had heaps of stone put up along the line as marks for identi=fication to which the Measurer adhered as personally instructed by the Deputy Commissioner, is herewith submitted.

2 No record of the settlement by the Deputy Commissioner has been received for guidance or information.

/Signed/ K. Ramswamiayer
Asst Supt.

Camp Malvalli
6th December/68

"Copies"
Supt
Supt Mysore Res. Survey

(General Serial No. 30.)

36

1890.

From

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

L. R. 53-88

To

The Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District.

Dated 26th July

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 4229

No. 196

From the Deputy Commissioner No. 35-4-1-90

Official Memorandum in the matter of the boundary dispute of the Jodi Village of Kittapalli in the Kolar Di-

No. 4249/196 of 26-7-90 8/8-8

37

Official Memorandum

(4)

With reference to the accompanying papers received from the Supdt. of Revenue Survey, the Dy. Commr. of Kolar is requested to forward as early as possible any record of enquiry held and decision passed by the Dy. Commr. in the matter of the boundary dispute of the Jodi village of Vittapalli in the Kolar Taluk.

By order

Under Secy.

To

The Dy. Commr., Kolar Dt.

9.10.9.90

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
5423
5 - SEP. 90
343

38

(General Serial No. 31.)

1890.

5

R. 53-88-14

From

The Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District.

To

The Chief-Secretary to the Government of Mysore.

Dated 1st
Despatched 4 } September 1890.
Received

Enclosures No. 2 Plus 1 V.P.

General No. 1635
No. 378 1890-91

Petition 20/9
CS
5/9/90

Subject Reco for precis
2 early - CS
9/9/90

Sir,

With official memorandum No: 4229/196 dated the 26th July last.

In returning the enclosures received with the above, have the honor to submit as per Serial attached, the accompanying file of papers which contains the record of enquiry by Mr. C. Sooba Roy, late Deputy Commissioner, in the matter of the alleged boundary dispute of Jodi Vittapalli village, Kolar Taluk. The boundaries as settled by that officer on a local

to be obligingly retransmitted

enquiry and reference to the old accounts are defined in a list (No. 5 on the 39 Salick Feriat) to be found in the enclosed file.

J. S. Marshall
Offg: Deputy Commissioner

(General Serial No. 30).

40

189/ .

L.R. 53-86-6

From

The Chief Secretary to the Devan

To

The Superintendent Revenue Survey

Dated 24
Despatched 30 } April/91
Received

Enclosures No. 2 v Files

General No. 1022 Ro
No. 16

Requests that fresh enquiry be made in regard to the boundary dispute of Jodi Vitapalli village & the matter decided on its merits.

Abstract sent to Ro 29-11-91

No. 1022 Ro Enc 2 V file.
16

To

(6)

The Subject of Revision of settlement

In forwarding a file of papers received with the Deputy Commr's order of 1st Sept 1890 No 1635/378, I ~~have the honour~~ am directed to request that you will cause a fresh enquiry to be made in regard to the boundary dispute of Lodi Vitapalli Village & decide the matter on its merits.—

2. The settlement made by the Deputy Commr in 1888 does not appear to have been agreed to by the Lodi'dars & the decision of the Deputy Commr does not contain sufficient particulars to show whether the dispute was properly

Settles or not. It does not ~~[illegible]~~ therefore seem proper to accept the decision of Mr. Dr Cent as final.

I have to

N.L.

24/4/91

N.L.

27/4

Sect

Mr is referred to the Supt of Secy, Settl to whom Mrs Pellew has been referred for enquiry & disposal

N.L.

27/4

Endorsement issued

30/4/91

No. 1255

D. R. 53-88-7

(1)

(7)

Endorsement.

In reply to Their Petition dated 21st Oct 1888

Shamanna and Ramappa Jodidars of Vitupalli, Kolar Taluq are referred to the Supt. of Rev: Survey & ~~are informed that~~ Settlement to whom their petition has been referred for enquiry and disposal.

By Order,

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
27/4/1891.
30

Draft

For Chief Secretary.

V.KR

Council order. AR

(General Serial No. 80.)

44

1892 . 4963

11 NOV. 92

From The Superintendent Mysore Revenue Survey.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 9th November 1892.

Despatched 10th

Received

Enclosures No. 3 & 1 file of Papers

General No. 648

No.

In reply to No. 1022/16 dated 27th April 1891

SUBJECT.

Forwarding Proceedings connected with the settlement of Vitapalli Boundary dispute and soliciting instructions as to whether the present settlement is to be accepted as final

Rep. Mysk 11/11/92

Read 12/11

Previous ref -
Letter dated 24th Apl 91 &
No 1022/16 L.R. 53-88-8
Reference put up & submitted to the Council for orders
25 Nov

Fix a day for hg Pets - Vitapalli Goldum -
1/12
11 Dec

Adjourned to 15th June 1893.

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Read 14/11

No 648

65

(11)

Survey Superintendent's Office
Bangalore 9th November 1892

To,

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

Sir,

Ten half annas stamps enclosed.
N
23/11/92

I have the honor, with reference to your letter No. 1022/16 dated 27th April 1891, to forward herewith, in original, separate Proceedings (to be kindly returned with reply) showing the fresh enquiry and settlement, by Mr. K. Ramswamiengar Assistant Superintendent Mysore Revenue Survey, of the Boundary Dispute between Vittalli and adjoining villages in the Kolar Taluk, and

to

to solicit instructions as to whether Mr. Ramaswamiangar's settlement is to be accepted as final.

2. The file of papers together with 10 half anna Postage stamps received with your letter under reply are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedt. Servant
Appa Rao
For Supdt. Mysore Rev. Survey

(15)

47 Proceedings of the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

L.R. 53-86-9

Read:

Petition no. 1255 ~~dated~~ of 1888
presented by Shamanna and
Narasappa, Jodidars of Vittapalli
Kolar Taluk, complaining that
the boundary of their inam village
was fixed by the Deputy Commissioner
in a way which excluded a portion
of their land.

(2) Letter from the Superintendent
Revenue Survey no. 648, dated
9th November 1892 forwarding
for ~~and~~ ~~[illegible]~~
the Proceedings of Mr. K. Ramaswamy
Iyengar, ~~Assistant Superintendent~~
~~Mysore Revenue Survey~~, relating
to the sand boundary dispute and
soliciting instructions as to
whether ~~the Ramaswamy Iyengar~~

with A. H. [illegible]

settlement is to be accepted.

Order thereon

No. 6548 / Pet. J. 42-94

Government have no objection to the boundary dispute being settled as suggested by the Assistant Survey Superintendent, Mr. K. Ramaswamieyar.

Petitioners have been heard as they accept the proposed settlement referred to in Memos nos. 2 and 3. They object to the settlement of the boundary dispute between Vittapalli and Manigatta and Gangarasanahalli referred to in Memo. no. 1, but have failed to show sufficient cause for altering the settlement proposed. Their appeal has therefore been dismissed.

10/10/94

Dsapp.

Chief Secretary

To the Superintendent Chr. Survey with the records.

No.

L. R. 53-88-1069

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

189

Endorsement granted to Shamanna and Nanjappa, Jodidars of Vittapalli, Kolar Taluq

in reply to their Petition Registered No. 1255 dated 24 October 1888, appealing against the order of the Commr Kolar settling the boundary disputes between Jodi Vittapalli and the Surrounding villages

Petitioner ~~is~~ are informed that

the settlement of boundaries proposed by the asst Supt of Revenue Survey has been accepted by Govt as final as no grounds were shown for altering it

11/10

"By Order"

22/10

Chief Secretary.

12/9

M. G. C. P., Bangalore—6-3-94.—2000.

(16)

56

నంబరు
1255.

సంతకాలు
తారీఖు
26-10-94

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 24-10-88 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1894 [illegible]

"By order"
Draft 25/10/94
for Chief Secy.